REMARKS

The remarks are numbered in accordance with the August 4, 2005 Office Action for ease in following:

Claim Rejections –35 USC § 102:

4. Claims 1 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,731,373 (Hirose et al). Applicant disagrees.

Claim 1 has been amended to replace "comprising" with "consisting essentially of". In doing so, the claim is no longer open ended. Thus, Hirose's disclosure in Example 5 which requires 5% silicone oil and 5% fatty ester oil falls outside the scope of Claim 1 of the present invention. Hence, Hirose fails to meet the prima facie case of anticipation of Claim 1 of the present invention.

Additionally, Hirose discloses the necessity of oil retaining material to attain a low coefficient of friction. (See column 7, lines 37-39, column 4, lines 34-36 and 47-52). In the present invention, no oil is required for good wear resistance and coefficient of friction to occur. (See Chart 1 (i.e.Pareto Chart), and Table 2)

Therefore, Claim 1, as amended, is believed to be in allowable condition. Claim 9 being dependent from Claim 1, is also believed to be in allowable condition for the same above stated reasons regarding amended Claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections –35 USC § 103:

6. Claims 6-8 and 10-12 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of US 5,731,373 (Hirose et al). Applicant disagrees.

Claim 1, has been amended as discussed above and is reiterated here. The present invention does not require the use of oil to attain the good wear and coefficient of friction desired. This is in contrast to the requirement of Hirose (see claim 1; Example 5; and column 7, lines 36-39) which requires the use of oil to achieve a low coefficient of friction. Hirose teaches away from the present invention by requiring the use of a lubricating oil. Thus, Claim 1 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 6-8 and 10-12 depend from Claim 1 and thus are believed to be in allowable condition for the reasons Claim 1 is believed allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections –35 USC § 112:

7. Claims 7, 8, 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant contends that claim 7 is further limited by claim 8 in that claim 7 references the use of chopped fiber which tends to be abrasive and have larger bundles (8.2 mm). Milled fiber is smaller in size (e.g. 150 microns) and gives better results as shown in Table 4 of the present specification due to it's lubrication properties. (The table on page 4 of the specification makes reference to the "milled carbon fiber" manufactured by Amoco shown in Table 4.)

Furthermore, claims 7, 8, 11 and 12 depend from presumably allowable amended Claim 1 which discloses a composition that differs from the cited art. These dependent claims add further limitations to amended claim 1. In view of the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1, these dependent claims are believed to overcome the indefiniteness rejection and are believed to be in allowable condition. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

No extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is believed due. However, should any fee be due in order to obtain consideration of this response, please charge that fee to Deposit Account No. 04-1928 (E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company.)

In view of the foregoing, allowance of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Tamera L. Fair

TAMERA L. FAIR
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT
Registration No.: 35,867
Telephone: (302) 892-7948
Facsimile: (302) 992-3257

Dated: November 03, 2005

T:\Patent Documents\Eng. Polymers\AD-69xx\AD6930\AD6930 US NA\AD6930 Amend_110305.doc